REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the Office Action of August 25, 2004. As stated above, claims 1, 3, 8 and 32 are currently amended. Claims 1-39 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 8, 11 and 12

1 -

5

15

20

25

30

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office rejected claims 8, 11 and 12 under §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,533,383 to Saruta et al., referred to herein as the Saruta reference.

Applicant currently amends claim 8 to recite an optical storage medium that comprises lands and pits. Such a storage medium is not susceptible to the electro-magnetic interference discussed in the Saruta reference. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 8, 11 and 12 are patentable.

Claims 32-33, 35-36 and 38-39

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office rejected claims 32-33, 35-36 and 38-39 under §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,533,383 to Saruta et al., referred to herein as the Saruta reference.

Applicant currently amends claim 32 to recite an optical storage medium that comprises lands and pits. Such a storage medium is not susceptible to the electro-magnetic interference discussed in the Saruta reference (e.g., interference associated with movement of a print head). For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 32-33, 35-36 and 38-39 are patentable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office rejected claims 1-7 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,533,383 to Saruta et al., referred to herein as the Saruta reference, in view of US Pat. No. 3,656,827 to Gamblin et al., referred to herein as the Gamblin reference.

Applicant currently amends claim 1 to recite an optical storage medium (e.g., a medium used for compact discs, etc.) comprising a holographic image. Such an optical storage medium is not susceptible to the electro-magnetic interference discussed in the Saruta reference (e.g., interference associated with movement of a print head). For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 1-7 are patentable.

Claims 9 and 34

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office rejected claims 9 and 34 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,533,383 to Saruta et al., referred to herein as the Saruta reference, in view of US Pat. No. 3,656,827 to Gamblin et al., referred to herein as the Gamblin reference.

Applicant currently amends claims 8 and 32, from which claims 9 and 34 depend. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 9 and 34 are patentable.

20

25

5

10

15

Claims 10 and 37

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office rejected claims 10 and 37 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,533,383 to Saruta et al., referred to herein as the Saruta reference, in view of US Pat. No. 5,812,156 to Bullock et al., referred to herein as the Bullock reference.

Applicant currently amends claims 8 and 32, from which claims 10 and 37 depend. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claims 10 and 37 are patentable.

30 Allowed Claims

In the Office Action mailed August 25, 2004, the Office allowed claims 13-31.

Conclusion

Claims 1-39 are pending and believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

10

5

Respectfully Submitted, Lee & Hayes, PLLC 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500 Spokane, WA 99201

15

Dated: 11/25/04

Name: Brian J. Pangrle

Reg. No. 42,973

Phone No. (509) 324-9256 ext. 231

20